

CONFERENCE OF THE EIGHTEEN-NATION COMMITTEE
ON DISARMAMENT

ENDC/PV.220
3 August 1965
ENGLISH

FINAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO HUNDRED AND TWENTIETH MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Tuesday, 3 August 1965, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman:

Lord CHALFONT

(United Kingdom)

OF MICHIGAN
DEC 23 1965
DOCUMENT
COLLECTION

65-21016

PRESENT AT THE TABLE

Brazil:

Mr. A. CORREA do LAGO
Mr. D. SILVEIRA da MOTA

Bulgaria:

Mr. C. LUKANOV
Mr. Y. GOLEMANOV
Mr. T. DAMIANOV
Mr. D. KOSTOV

Burma:

U SAIN BWA
U MAUNG MAUNG GYI

Canada:

Mr. E.L.M. BURNS
Mr. C.J. MARSHALL
Mr. P.D. LEE

Czechoslovakia:

Mr. Z. CERNIK
Mr. V. VAJNAR
Mr. R. KLEIN
Mr. F. DOBIAS

Ethiopia:

Lij M. IMRU
Mr. A. ZELLEKE
Mr. T. BEKELE

India:

Mr. V.C. TRIVEDI
Mr. K.P. LUKOSE

Italy:

Mr. F. CAVALLETTI
Mr. E. GUIDOTTI
Mr. S. AVETTA
Mr. G.P. TOZZOLI

PRESENT AT THE TABLE (Cont'd)

Mexico:

Mr. A. GOMEZ ROBLEDO
Mr. M. TELLO MACIAS

Nigeria:

Mr. L.C.N. OBI
Mr. O.O. ADESOLA

Poland:

Mr. M. LOBODYCZ
Mr. E. STANIEWSKI
Mr. A. SKOWRONSKI
Mr. R. KRZYZANOWSKI

Romania:

Mr. V. DUMITRESCU
Mr. E. GLASER
Mr. N. ECOBESCU
Mr. C. UNGUREANU

Sweden:

Mrs. A. MYRDAL
Mr. P. HAMMARSKJOLD
Mr. B. VEGESACK
Mr. J. PRAWITZ

Union of Soviet Socialist
Republics:

Mr. S.K. TSARAPKIN
Mr. Y.M. VORONTSOV
Mr. G.K. EFIMOV
Mr. S.A. BOGOMOLOV

United Arab Republic:

Mr. A.F. HASSAN
Mr. A. OSMAN
Mr. M. KASSEM
Mr. A. SALAM

United Kingdom:

Lord CHALFONT
Sir Harold BEELEY
Mr. J.G. TAHOURDIN
Mr. T.J. ALEXANDER

PRESENT AT THE TABLE (Cont'd)

United States of America:

Mr. W.C. FOSTER
Mr. C.H. TIMBERLAKE
Mr. D.S. MACDONALD
Mr. W.A. HAYNE

Special Representative of the
Secretary-General:

Mr. D. PROTITCH

Deputy Special Representative
of the Secretary-General:

Mr. W. EPSTEIN

The CHAIRMAN (United Kingdom): I declare open the two hundred and twentieth plenary meeting of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translation from Russian):

In casting an eye over the events of the past year which form a sombre background to the present session of the Eighteen-Nation Committee, one cannot help recalling the message which the President of the United States, Mr. Johnson, addressed to our Committee on 21 January 1964. In that message he stated the following:

"Today your search begins anew in a climate of hope. Last year's genuine gains have given us new momentum. ... Let us pray that the tide has turned - that further and more far-reaching agreements lie ahead - and that future generations will mark 1964 as the year the world turned for all time away from the horrors of war and constructed new bulwarks of peace". (ENDC/120)

Excellent words, there can be no gainsaying.

But 1964 has passed and what have we seen? What is the situation in which the world finds itself? Yes, indeed, a new tide has turned, but not a tide of peaceful achievements; not a tide - to borrow the language of the aforesaid message - of "far-reaching agreements", not a tide whereon "the world turned for all time away from the horrors of war and constructed new bulwarks of peace". No, a dark tide of imperialistic aggression has swept upon the world, a tide of crude violence and of intervention in the internal affairs of other States. Everywhere we see violations of the territorial integrity and political independence of States. The United States has carried out an armed attack on Viet Nam. For the last six months it has been waging against the freedom-loving people of Viet Nam the most real kind of war - a ruthless, destructive and barbarous war. The United States has trampled the integrity, sovereignty and political independence of the Dominican Republic under the heavy boot of its invading army. The world has been eye-witness of the grossest violation by the United States of the United Nations Charter and the standards of international law.

Certain speakers who have made statements here have called upon us to talk only about disarmament and not to touch upon those events which have left their mark on international life and are poisoning international relations. But those sombre aspects of present-day international relations cannot be disregarded if we wish to consider and resolve the problems before us in the proper light. Of course, it is no pleasure for certain representatives to listen to bitter words concerning the policy of the Western Powers; but those representatives must realize that what is said here about

(Mr. Tsarapkin, USSR)

the policy of the Western Powers, and above all about the policy of the United States, is a direct consequence of the aggressive, imperialistic policy of the Western Powers, of the policy of the United States. But for that policy there would be no war in Viet Nam, there would be no facts of aggression and intervention in the internal affairs of other States; and then, of course, there would be no grounds for any talk on that subject here.

The fact that disarmament negotiations, both in earlier days and in the Eighteen-Nation Committee, have proved fruitless up to the present time fully and clearly confirms that the cause of disarmament is closely connected with and directly dependent on the policy pursued by States. During all this time the Western Powers, while paying lip-service to disarmament, have in fact taken a position which virtually blocks any progress whatsoever in the negotiations on the most important problem of our times. The position of the Western Powers in regard to disarmament, as is evident from their proposals and from the statements of their representatives in the Eighteen-Nation Committee, derives from their political concept, which is that in their opinion the armed forces of States will remain the decisive factor in international affairs right up to the last stage of disarmament. Of course, with such a concept no disarmament by the Western Powers is to be expected.

The whole gist of the matter is that the policy of the Western States members of NATO in the field of disarmament is far from being positive. That is the root of the evil, that is the cause of the failure of the work of the Eighteen-Nation Committee throughout the whole time of its existence. Anyone who has eyes to see will easily notice the existence of a close connexion between the lack of progress in disarmament negotiations and the aggressive imperialistic policy of the United States. If disarmament negotiations are to be successful, fundamental changes must be made in the policy of the United States. But the policy of the United States, as we see, has become even more challenging, provocative and aggressive, and this is shown by the United States war in Viet Nam and the further increase of tension in other parts of South-East Asia, the violation of the sovereignty of the Dominican Republic and its occupation by United States troops, the armed interference of the United States in the affairs of the Congo, and other facts.

At our first meeting we pointed out (ENDC/PV.218, page 8) that in the present troubled times, when there is a further worsening of the international situation, increased efforts would have to be made in every direction in order to prevent any further menacing development of events in the world, to put an end to the policy of

(Mr. Tsarapkin, USSR)

imperialistic aggression and take the path of a policy of peaceful co-existence, and to reach agreement on real disarmament measures, and on measures aimed at halting the arms race and relaxing tension in international relations. Only such a policy can ensure the success of disarmament negotiations and bring lasting peace to mankind.

As for the Soviet Union, following the general line of its policy it has no intention of reducing its efforts in the struggle for peace, disarmament, the relaxation of international tension and the halting of the arms race. The more complex the situation in the world and the greater the danger of war, the more important it becomes to fight for disarmament and the relaxation of international tension, the greater are the efforts required in order to solve these urgent problems, the closer must be the union of all the anti-imperialist forces of the world. The Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, Mr. Kosygin, said in his speech in Riga on 17 July 1965:

"The Soviet Union is carrying out a consistent foreign policy; it is giving a setback to international aggressors and defending the principle of the peaceful co-existence of States with different social systems. The struggle for the implementation of the principle of peaceful co-existence is a many-sided and varied one. It includes activities in favour of disarmament and the relaxation of international tension, the firm defence of the national sovereignty and territorial integrity of States large and small, and decisive actions against interference in the internal affairs of other countries".

In line with this, the Soviet Government deemed it necessary at the beginning of the year to take the initiative in the matter of convening the United Nations Disarmament Commission in order to discuss the disquieting state of the negotiations in the Eighteen-Nation Committee and to lay down practical ways which would make it possible to achieve progress in solving the urgent problems of disarmament and the reduction of international tension.

As we know, for nearly two months the United Nations Disarmament Commission carefully studied the situation which had come about in the disarmament negotiations and discussed present-day problems of disarmament. It noted the extremely unsatisfactory state of the disarmament negotiations in the Eighteen-Nation Committee, and many representatives of States who spoke in the Commission expressed legitimate concern and disappointment in this respect. Many representatives in the Commission pointed out that the cause of that intolerable state of affairs in the Committee was the unwillingness

(Mr. Tsarapkin, USSR)

of the United States and its allies in the NATO aggressive military bloc to carry out disarmament, and their attempts, in their statements in the Committee on the subject of disarmament, to divert attention from the United States policy aimed at intensifying the arms race and preparing for the unleashing of aggressive wars. And that is fully confirmed by the facts.

Thus, whereas during the three years of its existence the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament, owing to the fact that the United States and its NATO allies have blocked all possibilities of progress, has produced only piles of records containing speeches on disarmament, during the same time the United States itself, according to the testimony of such a competent person as the Defence Secretary of the United States, Robert McNamara, has produced something more substantial. At a Press conference on 14 July this year Mr. McNamara said that during the past four years the United States had increased by 200 per cent the numbers and weight in megatons of the nuclear weapons at the disposal of its strategic forces which were in a state of permanent readiness; it had increased its tactical nuclear strength in Western Europe by 67 per cent; it had increased the strength of its armed divisions ready for military action by 45 per cent; it had increased by 100 per cent the number of squadrons of tactical fighters; it had increased by 100 per cent the means of transporting troops by air; it had increased by 100 per cent the construction of new types of warships for the purpose of modernizing the Navy - and so on.

The extensive exchange of views which took place in the United Nations Disarmament Commission showed very clearly once again that the peoples and the overwhelming majority of States throughout the world are vitally interested in Disarmament. The discussion in the Commission clearly confirmed the fact that the majority of countries are filled with determination to strive with all their might to put an end to the deadly arms race and to achieve general and complete disarmament for the good of all mankind. In the course of the discussion on disarmament questions in the Commission, important priority measures aimed at curbing the arms race, reducing international tension and promoting general and complete disarmament were also made known and received wide support from many countries.

From the tribune of the United Nations Disarmament Commission a clear and convincing appeal was made by many States - socialist States as well as developing States of Africa, Asia and Latin America - for the dismantling of foreign military bases and the withdrawal of foreign troops from the territories of other countries.

(Mr. Tsarapkin, USSR)

In addition to the delegations of the socialist countries, the delegations of the United Arab Republic, Ghana, Mali, Syria, Iraq, Uganda and other States spoke in the Commission in favour of carrying out this measure which, in the light of present-day events, is important and urgent. Besides the socialist countries, many non-aligned States, including Nigeria, Ethiopia, Mexico, Guinea, Mali, Tanzania, Syria, Chile and Sweden, spoke in favour of the implementation of another important measure - the immediate prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons.

Growing concern was perceptible in the statements of many representatives in the Commission in connexion with the increasing danger of the dissemination of nuclear weapons, including the danger of the dissemination of nuclear weapons through a NATO multilateral nuclear force, to which attention was drawn both by socialist delegations and by the representatives of Nigeria, Ghana, Uganda, Nepal, Pakistan, Mexico, the United Arab Republic and others. An important result of the work of the United Nations Disarmament Commission was its adoption of a resolution (DC/224; ENDC/149) proposing the convening of a world disarmament conference, which would have an important role to play in co-ordinating the efforts of all States interested in achieving disarmament and eliminating the threat of war.

What, then, are the tasks before our Committee in the light of the present situation? It is essential to find as quickly as possible a solution to the fundamental questions of disarmament and thereby eliminate decisively, once and for all, the material and technical potentialities of States for unleashing war and aggressive actions. It is necessary to set about solving the key questions of the problems of general and complete disarmament; unless those questions are solved, it is impossible to secure the elimination of the threat of a devastating thermo-nuclear war which hangs over mankind. In this connexion we assume that success in this matter can be ensured only by bold and radical measures having for their main objective the speediest possible abolition of the types of armaments most dangerous to mankind, and in the first place, of course, nuclear armaments.

It is a noteworthy fact, however, that in setting forth the position of his Government in the Eighteen-Nation Committee on 27 July (ENDC/PV.218) the United States representative Mr. Foster, said nothing at all about the problem of general and complete disarmament, as though this problem were outside the purview of the Eighteen-Nation Committee. Nor was anything said in support of the idea of general and complete disarmament in President Johnson's message (ENDC/150) which was read out by Mr. Foster in the Committee.

(Mr. Tsarapkin, USSR)

One may well ask: what does this mean? Perhaps the United States Government no longer considers itself bound by the well-known resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly (ENDC/139) which proclaim that the main task of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament is to prepare an agreement on general and complete disarmament.

The Soviet delegation is prepared, as in the past, to exert every effort required in order to achieve progress in the negotiations on the main disarmament questions. But in order that the negotiations may be successful it is of course necessary that good will and a desire for agreement should be manifested by all parties. If, however, the representatives of the United States and other Western Powers continue as before to oppose real disarmament measures, the implementation of which would ensure a real and not an imaginary reduction of the threat of a nuclear missile war, and if, instead of such measures, they insist on such an approach to disarmament as would in fact be conducive to maintaining the threat of a nuclear missile war, it is a foregone conclusion that the negotiations on general and complete disarmament in the Eighteen-Nation Committee will not get out of the impasse and that the hopes of the peoples for delivery from the burden of armaments and the threat of nuclear war will be disappointed.

In the work of the Eighteen-Nation Committee, an important place should be given to the consideration and adoption of measures aimed at curbing the arms race and reducing international tension. What have the representatives of the Western Powers brought with them to the Eighteen-Nation Committee in this respect? Have they put forward any measures whatsoever which would take into account the present international situation and would be designed to eliminate the now increased threat of a nuclear missile war? The statements made by the representative of the United States, Mr. Foster (ENDC/PV.218), and the representative of the United Kingdom, Lord Chalfont (ENDC/PV.219), at previous meetings show that the Western Powers have sent their delegations to the Eighteen-Nation Committee with old proposals made several years ago which in substance do not provide for disarmament; they ignore all the urgent questions which are perturbing the peoples of the world today.

(Mr. Tsarapkin, USSR)

Once again we are asked to conduct negotiations on such an agreement concerning the non-dissemination of nuclear weapons as would leave West Germany the possibility of gaining access to nuclear weapons through a multilateral, Atlantic or other NATO nuclear force; which is absolutely unacceptable to the Soviet Union, as the Western Powers are well aware. Once again we hear the old proposal for a cessation of the production of fissionable materials for military purposes. That proposal leaves out the question of eliminating the existing stockpiles of nuclear materials, although it is precisely those materials that constitute a threat. It is obvious that the implementation of that measure proposed by the United States would in no way reduce the existing danger of nuclear war. An attempt is again being made to bring to the attention of the participants in the negotiations the long-since discredited and rejected proposal for a freeze on strategic nuclear bombers and missiles. And the proposal for the prohibition of underground nuclear tests, which are being carried out intensively by the United States alone, is linked with a demand for international inspection, thus making agreement on this question also impossible.

Once again the United Kingdom delegation has proposed setting up technical and working groups within the Committee, although it is well-known that the establishment of such groups would merely lead to all disarmament questions being bogged down for many years within these technical groups.

What stands out most clearly in the proposals of the United States and the United Kingdom is the fact that all the measures proposed carefully bypass everything that is causing the present international tension. As everyone can see, the measures proposed by them in no way affect the ability of the United States to continue its aggression in Vietnam and in other parts of the world. But the Committee cannot shut itself off with a blank wall from the outside world, from the events that are taking place in the world around us. Yet, to judge by the Western proposals, in the positions of the United States and the United Kingdom there shows through quite clearly an attempt at the very beginning of the present session to turn the work of the Committee back into the old rut, which could lead the present negotiations also into an impasse.

(Mr. Tsarapkin, USSR)

The Soviet delegation considers that, in selecting the measures with which the Eighteen-Nation Committee should deal, we should start out from the requirements of the present-day situation, take it into account, and proceed with the tasks of eliminating the threat of a thermo-nuclear war and reducing international tension. The Eighteen-Nation Committee should make energetic and persistent efforts to achieve immediately the implementation of such measures, which would really be an important contribution to the strengthening of peace, the lessening of international tension and the reinforcement of international security.

At the present time, when the development of events is becoming ever more alarming, it is important to remove from the international situation everything in the way of inflammable material that can easily be set on fire, everything that is driving the world towards the brink of a thermo-nuclear war. If we want the Eighteen-Nation Committee to cope successfully with the tasks assigned to it, it is essential that the guns should be silent, that United States aggression in Viet Nam and in other parts of the world should cease, and that the United States and the other Western Powers should show their willingness to settle urgent questions by peaceful means and in a peaceful atmosphere.

A broad programme of measures the implementation of which would undoubtedly help to stop the dangerous development of events in the world and ensure a radical change for the better in the whole international situation is set forth in the Soviet Government's memorandum of 7 December 1964 (A/5827), which is well known to all the representatives here. In the conditions of today the interests of safeguarding peace and international security insistently bring to the fore the questions of the dismantling of foreign military bases and the withdrawal of foreign troops from the territories of other countries, prevention of the further dissemination of nuclear weapons in any form, whether directly or indirectly, and prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons. These measures are dictated by life itself, and it is precisely on them that the attention of the Committee should be concentrated and possibilities for a satisfactory agreement found.

(Mr. Tsarapkin, USSR)

Let each representative ask himself: in what areas of the world are the flames of war burning today? Where are hotbeds of military conflict flaring up which threaten peace and the sovereignty of peoples? The question is easily answered: the rumble of guns and the explosion of bombs are reverberated from those areas of the world in which there are foreign military bases and foreign troops. Mr. Foster and Lord Chalfont - that is, the representatives of the countries which have a dense network of military bases on the territories of other countries - preferred not to deal with that question in their statements; but that is precisely where one of the reasons for the existing international tension is to be found today. It is precisely from there that the danger to the peace of the whole world stems.

How can we expect any improvement in the international situation or any progress in disarmament negotiations when the United States is perpetrating aggression against the people of Viet Nam, subjecting the territory of the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam to barbarous bombings and waging an extensive punitive war to suppress the national liberation movement in South Viet Nam? Here, in South-East Asia, the aggressive, imperialistic role of American and other military bases on the territories of other countries, their purpose as springboards of aggression and a means of combating national liberation movements, is exposed in its most naked form before the whole world. From its air bases in South Viet Nam and from its aircraft carriers of the 7th Fleet, the United States Air Force is carrying out raids against the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam, sowing death and destruction and torturing that young country.

The United States military bases situated in other nearby areas are also being actively used for aggressive purposes, for waging war against the Vietnamese people. A few days ago the newspapers reported that United States B-52 jet bombers based on the island of Okinawa were being used to strike at the South Vietnamese guerrillas. Reports are coming in about the increase in United States military strength in Thailand, where a number of United States military bases are also located. The whole system of United States bases aimed against the peoples of South-East Asia has been brought into a state of combat readiness.

(Mr. Tsarapkin, USSR)

The Eighteen-Nation Committee, which has been assigned the task of laying down the path to disarmament and the relaxation of international tension, cannot disregard the actions in Viet Nam of the United States, which is using its military bases and troops for waging an aggressive, imperialistic war.

The task of dismantling foreign military bases and withdrawing foreign troops from the territories of other countries will be seen in all its magnitude and significance if we take into account that the United States now possesses outside its own territory - that is, abroad - hundreds of military bases with a total of more than one million officers and men; that is, more than one-third of all the United States armed forces. What is happening today in South-East Asia may happen tomorrow in other areas of the world where imperialistic military bases and troops are situated on the territories of other countries. The existence of those troops and bases deepens mistrust and suspicion in international relations, increases tension, and creates a dangerously explosive situation.

That is why the question of dismantling foreign military bases and withdrawing foreign troops from the territories of other countries assumes particularly great significance in these troubled days. That is why we now find on our agenda the urgent question of the immediate withdrawal of foreign troops from South Viet Nam, Taiwan, the Congo, South Korea, Malaysia and also, of course, from the territories of European States and other areas of the world. All foreign military bases must be eliminated; that is the insistent, imperative demand of all those who are genuinely interested in safeguarding peace and in disarmament.

An important question calling insistently for solution is that of preventing the creation of a NATO multilateral nuclear force in any form and preventing access by the German revanchists to nuclear weapons. It is a question of preventing the further spread of nuclear weapons in any form and of not allowing the threat of a nuclear war to grow.

(Mr. Tsarapkin, USSR)

In their statements the representative of the United States, Mr. Foster, the representative of the United Kingdom, Lord Chalfont, and the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Italy, Mr. Fanfani (ENDC/PV.219), devoted considerable attention to the question of the non-dissemination of nuclear weapons. However, they all of them dealt with only one side of the problem which causes concern: namely the question of the non-transfer of nuclear weapons directly to the national control of States. But what about the other side of the question, which is precisely the one that is now most urgent and acute: namely what is to be done about the question of the transfer of nuclear weapons or of access to nuclear weapons in one form or another through military blocs and alliances, or specifically through the NATO military bloc?

In his statement Lord Chalfont, reflecting the well-known point of view of the Western Powers, said that the creation of a NATO nuclear force would not mean the dissemination of nuclear weapons. In reality, however, the case is altogether different. Judge for yourselves: why, in the Western capitals, are plans being considered for the creation of a NATO nuclear force in one form or another if, as the Western representatives assert, everything will remain unchanged in the nuclear field? In fact, if we consider the gist of the problem it becomes perfectly clear that the creation of any kind of NATO nuclear force would give access to nuclear weapons in the first place to West Germany, and consequently would mean the dissemination of nuclear weapons, and dissemination precisely to that State which is pursuing a policy particularly hostile to peace.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany indeed makes no secret of the fact that it expects to obtain nuclear weapons for West Germany through a multilateral, Atlantic or other NATO nuclear force. The representatives here are no doubt aware that some weeks ago, shortly before the opening of our conference, the West German Minister for Foreign Affairs, Dr. Schroeder, in an interview he gave to the Düsseldorfer Nachrichten, raised the question of nuclear weapons being made available to West Germany. In that interview Dr. Schroeder openly stated the following:

(Mr. Tsarapkin, USSR)

"If this question is decided by way of the creation of a multilateral Atlantic deterrent force or its equivalent, then Germany could tell its allies that it was prepared to renounce the acquisition of its own atomic weapons." 1/

In that statement the West German Minister dotted all the i's, as the saying goes; Dr. Schroeder personally confirmed what has been pointed out many times by the Soviet Union. Indeed, if we single out the most important point in that interview, we find that the Federal Republic of Germany considers the creation of a NATO multilateral nuclear force and West German participation in that force as tantamount to having its own atomic weapons. It is perfectly clear from that interview that the statesmen of the Federal Republic of Germany make no distinction between obtaining atomic weapons through a NATO nuclear force and the acquisition by West Germany of its own atomic weapons. In other words, the establishment of a NATO multilateral or Atlantic nuclear force gives West Germany access to the nuclear arsenals of the West, as the Soviet Union Government has repeatedly pointed out; and this meets West Germany's persistent demands in regard to nuclear weapons.

The policy of the Federal Republic of Germany aimed at obtaining nuclear weapons can lead to a world thermo-nuclear war. It is perfectly clear that West Germany is attempting to obtain nuclear bombs in order to be able to advance its revanchist claims with still greater force, using for that purpose even the possibilities of nuclear blackmail. From the banks of the Rhine we hear incessant calls for the redrawing of the postwar frontiers of Europe, and demands for the forcible detachment from Poland and Czechoslovakia of territories rightfully held by them. Only a month ago, at a revanchist meeting in Stuttgart, a statement setting forth the claims of the West German revanchists to Czechoslovak territory was adopted and widely publicized. The danger is now becoming even more obvious that West German militarism by its policy may start the conflagration of a world thermo-nuclear war.

1/ Translated from Russian.

(Mr. Tsarapkin, USSR)

That is why the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries take so firm and resolute a stand against the militarization of the Federal Republic of Germany, and against giving the West German Bundeswehr access to nuclear weapons. That is why we utter warnings and declare our resolute opposition to plans for the creation of a multilateral, Atlantic, or any other kind of NATO nuclear force which would give the Federal Republic of Germany access to nuclear weapons.

The peace-loving States cannot but be alarmed by the benevolent attitude towards the claims of the Federal Republic of Germany to nuclear weapons which has been manifested in a number of Western countries, and particularly in the United Kingdom. Wide currency is given to arguments alleging that it is necessary to satisfy the "legitimate" demands of the militarists of the Federal Republic of Germany for "equal defence possibilities", and to find ways to meet the insolent claims to atomic weapons made by the die-hard Nazi generals who are at the head of the Bundeswehr, etc. This attitude has been given in the Western Press the very apt name of an "atomic Munich".

The new offensive of the revanchists of the Federal Republic of Germany for the purpose of obtaining access to nuclear weapons, and the connivance of the Western allies of Bonn, show that the Western Powers are indeed inclined to agree to satisfy the nuclear demands of the Bonn revanchists, sacrificing to that militarist plan agreement on the non-dissemination of nuclear weapons. If the matter turns out in that way, then a situation will be created which will lead, in the words of Lord Chalfont, "to a world of nuclear anarchy" (ENDC/PV.219, p.14).

Another important measure towards eliminating the threat of a thermo-nuclear war and curbing the arms race would be the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons. For a long time the Soviet Union has advocated the prohibition and complete destruction of nuclear weapons. That idea has now been approved and supported by many States which are genuinely perturbed by the growing threat of nuclear war. It is common knowledge that the Soviet Government supports the proposal to hold a conference for the purpose of concluding an agreement on the prohibition of nuclear weapons. The situation calls for the earliest possible implementation of the declaration adopted on this question at the sixteenth session of the General Assembly (A/RES/1653 (XVI)).

(Mr. Tsarapkin, USSR)

At its previous sessions the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament has considered that question and has been unable to achieve constructive results solely because the United States and the United Kingdom are stubbornly opposed to reaching agreement on the question. Apparently the United States and the United Kingdom wish to retain a free hand in the matter of the use of nuclear weapons: they wish to retain the possibility of nuclear blackmail in regard to other States. But that is a dangerous position and, if it is maintained any longer, the threat of a thermonuclear war will continue to grow. The interests of the safeguarding of international security urgently require that the United States and the United Kingdom should abandon their negative position and agree with the majority of States of the world which are in favour of prohibiting nuclear weapons.

Twenty years have passed since the day the United States dropped the first atomic bombs on the Japanese cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The memory of the victims of that atomic bombing serves today as a cruel reminder of the horrors involved in the use of nuclear weapons. At the present time enormous stockpiles of atomic weapons have been accumulated in the world. Bombs have been manufactured which are several thousand times more powerful than the first atomic bombs dropped twenty years ago on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Nuclear war in present-day conditions would have catastrophic, irremediable consequences. That is why it is so important now, in the interests of all mankind, to agree on the absolute prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons and thereby fulfil the will of all peoples who are in favour of eliminating the threat of nuclear war.

The Soviet Government also proposes that, even before an agreement banning the use of nuclear weapons is concluded, those Powers which possess nuclear weapons should make a declaration to the effect that they will not be the first to use such weapons. The Soviet Union for its part is prepared to assume such an undertaking if the other nuclear Powers will do likewise. The Soviet delegation, of course, is also prepared to consider other proposals which would really lead to a reduction of international tension and to the strengthening of peace.

An important and serious task confronts the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament at this time of strain. The peoples of the world expect us, not to hold endless discussions about disarmament, not just to look at each other's proposals

(Mr. Tsarapkin, USSR)

seriously, as suggested by Lord Chalfont at our last meeting (ENDC/PV.219, p.14), but to take rapid and decisive action and to adopt concrete decisions aimed at diminishing the threat of war, reducing international tension and putting an end to the arms race. The Soviet Union has made such concrete proposals. Only one thing is required for effective action by the Committee: the Western participants in our negotiations -- and in the first place the United States -- must abandon the policy directed towards aggression, the policy directed towards continuing the arms race, the policy directed towards war. Otherwise the words of the United States representative here in the Committee will be drowned in the rumble coming from the explosions of American bombs, shells and mines in Viet Nam, the Dominican Republic and other areas of the world.

The peoples of all countries are yearning for a lasting peace and for disarmament. It is our duty here to work out expeditiously concrete and effective measures for the fulfilment of those hopes of the peoples throughout the world. A heavy responsibility will fall on those who, through their aggressive acts, continue to oppose this.

The CHAIRMAN (United Kingdom): I call on the United States representative, who wishes to speak in exercise of his right of reply.

Mr. FOSTER (United States of America): I do not propose to comment today on all the alleged points made by the Soviet representative, particularly those aspects which are relevant to our discussion here and which I should like to study in the verbatim record. I must say that, while I find very little encouragement in his remarks, I can endorse one view expressed by him -- that the international situation makes it all the more important that we here make progress in our work. As I pointed out in the discussions of the Disarmament Commission, that is also the view of the United States. Much as I am accustomed to hear distorted, intemperate and unsupportable remarks from the representative of the Soviet Union, I can only deplore those statements made here today. I think most of us came here hopefully after the non-aligned resolution (DC/225; ENDC/149) was so broadly supported at New York; and I find that today's opening remarks by our Soviet colleague certainly hold disappointment for most of us.

I regret that the Soviet representative has chosen once more to use a disarmament forum to make false accusations regarding United States policies and actions in

(Mr. Foster, United States)

Viet Nam. I regret it particularly because the business of this Committee is disarmament and no useful purpose is served by attempts to divert us from that purpose. I regret it also because the views expressed by the Soviet representative this morning are tendentious and compel me to take up more of our time here to set the record straight. Regardless of any attempt to portray the communist aggression in Viet Nam as a just war of national liberation, the world knows that what is taking place there is an effort on the part of the North to seize control of a country whose only offence is its determination to live in peace and freedom.

During the past six months there has been a great increase in the effort being made being made by Hanoi. As the infiltration and terror directed from the North have increased, the United States has had to increase its assistance in resisting this aggression. Make no mistake: we are determined to fulfil our commitment to help South Viet Nam to resist this aggression, but we have not lost sight of the goal of a peaceful settlement. The United States remains determined to keep searching for a political solution to this problem. Even as we provide the Vietnamese with the help they need to resist the aggression from Hanoi, we are equally prepared to undertake unconditional discussions whenever Hanoi is ready. Starting in the spring, we initiated some actions ourselves and supported some initiated by others which probed in many ways the possibility of engaging in discussion with Hanoi or Peking looking towards a settlement. Fifteen efforts have already been made to start these discussions with the help of some forty nations throughout the world. In the light of these initiatives, we have satisfied ourselves that the channels to the other side are open even if nothing but abuse comes back.

We shall therefore persevere in our search for a peaceful solution. At the moment it seems clear that the other side is not prepared to negotiate. At present, therefore, we have no choice but to continue to impress on the other side by military means that its aggression will be more costly than any benefit it can derive. This may take time, but the United States will persevere.

The record today is clear: on the one side, a willingness to undertake discussions over a wide variety of ideas and methods, and without pre-conditions; on the other side, intransigence and an unabating output of harsh propaganda. We will never cease our efforts to find a workable solution to this problem, a solution that

(Mr. Foster, United States)

will enable the people of Viet Nam to live in peace. As President Johnson said last Wednesday:

"... we welcome and we ask for the concern and the assistance of any nation and all nations. If the United Nations and its officials or any one of its 114 Members can by deed or word, private initiative or public action, bring us nearer an honourable peace, then they will have the support and gratitude of the United States of America."

In a letter to the President of the Security Council which he asked be circulated to all members of the Council, Ambassador Goldberg followed up the President's statement, making these four points:

"First, the United States will continue to provide, in whatever measure and for whatever period is necessary, assistance to the people of the Republic of Viet Nam in defending their independence, their sovereignty, and their right to choose their own government and make their own decisions.

"Second, the United States will continue to assist in the economic and social advancement of South-East Asia, under the leadership of Asian countries and the United Nations, and will continue to explore all additional possibilities, especially in connexion with the great projects taking shape in the lower Mekong basin.

"Third, the United States will continue to explore, independently and in conjunction with others, all possible routes to an honourable and durable peace in South-East Asia.

"Fourth, the United States stands ready, as it has in the past, to collaborate unconditionally with members of the Security Council in the search for an acceptable formula to restore peace and security to that area of the world." (S/6575, p.3)

Our objective in Viet Nam is not military conquest but peaceful settlement. Let me quote again from President Johnson's statement of last week to make this absolutely clear. He said:

"... we do not seek the destruction of any government, nor do we covet a foot of any territory, but we insist and we will always insist that the people of South Viet Nam shall have the right of choice, the right to shape their own destiny in free elections in the south or throughout all Viet Nam, under inter-

(Mr. Foster, United States)

national supervision, and that they shall not have any government imposed upon them by force and terror so long as we can prevent it."

May I express the hope also that I shall not be compelled to take up our valuable time in the future to set the record straight on matters such as this? My country's record in defence of peace and freedom, not only for ourselves but for all those who ask our help against aggression, speaks for itself. Repetition of attacks and charges such as we have heard here will not change the facts. Moreover, the debate on such issues is not the proper concern of this Conference. We are charged with the urgent responsibility of making progress towards disarmament. Let us all bend our ennergies towards that goal.

We had thought that the Soviet Union had had ample opportunity during the two months last spring when the United Nations Disarmament Commission was in session to press its propaganda campaign, but it seems that it is not yet satisfied. We came here to negotiate, not to indulge in an exchange of polemics. We believe that progress in disarmament and arms control is urgent and essential. We have made a number of concrete and practical proposals. The Soviet Union has ignored them. It has simply entered its old, tired horses in the disarmament field. Must we continue to be deluged with invective, or can we hope that we can get on with the real business of this Conference? I sincerely hope so, and I pledge that my delegation intends to do exactly that.

I reserve my right to comment at greater length as opportunity provides in later meetings.

The CHAIRMAN (United Kingdom): I call on the representative of Italy, who also wishes to exercise his right of reply.

Mr. CAVALLETTI (Italy) (translation from French): In its first statement the Soviet delegation has unfortunately tried today to introduce into our debates an atmosphere of polemics and tension by making unjustified attacks on the policy of all the Western countries, and particularly on the policy of the United States and that of the Federal Republic of Germany. The Italian delegation feels bound to express its very great regret at this manner of proceeding, which not only does not contribute anything to the useful and concrete development of this Conference, but may even delay and hamper positive results.

(Mr. Cavalletti, Italy)

The representative of the Soviet Union felt obliged to refer, in terms loaded with accusation, to the crisis which is developing in South-East Asia -- a crisis in regard to which every effort has been made by the United States Government to reach negotiated and peaceful solutions as quickly as possible. Today once again the United States Government has reiterated its invitation to the United Nations to co-operate actively in the search for such solutions.

In his statement last Thursday the Minister for Foreign Affairs of my country also referred to the Viet Nam crisis (ENDC/PV.219, p. 16), but he did so for a purpose completely opposite to that which Mr. Tsarapkin seems to have. For our part, we hold that this Geneva Conference -- this re-establishment of contacts in which Italy takes a lively interest -- must tend to promote the creation of a better climate, must help to influence in a favourable and moderating manner the crises which unfortunately exist elsewhere. That, it seems to us, is one of the very important aims of this session of the Conference, which is and must be a factor of peace, relaxation of tension and rapprochement, not a factor of discord.

Unfortunately, to listen to the Soviet delegation one might think the opposite and believe that the crises existing elsewhere could, by their influence, depress the atmosphere of this Conference to such an extent that our work would be retarded thereby. But we are only at the beginning of our session, and I hope that these regrettable tendencies which have come to the fore this morning will be short-lived and will give way to an outlook and observations that are more constructive. During the work of the United Nations Disarmament Commission the beginning of the discussions was also marked by polemical and propaganda statements; but subsequently the Soviet delegation adopted a more moderate tone, so that the Commission was able to do concrete and essentially satisfactory work.

The Italian delegation, for its part, will continue to do its best to make it possible for the Geneva spirit to prevail in our discussions. We shall do our utmost to avoid polemics, attacks and counter-attacks, convinced as we are that the great majority of the delegations here present will endeavour to do the same. I am confident, therefore, that once we have got beyond these first exchanges -- which were perhaps inevitable -- the Committee will be able to set about working seriously and with the utmost urgency in order to arrive at those conclusions, agreements and understandings which are absolutely indispensable for peace at the present time.

(Mr. Cavalletti, Italy)

Fortunately Mr. Tsarapkin's statement did not consist of polemics alone. He also told us about the position of his delegation with regard to the various problems on our agenda. I want to assure the representative of the Soviet Union that my delegation will study that part of his statement with the greatest attention. I also considered rather encouraging the words he uttered towards the end of his speech, when he said in substance that the Committee should not get bogged down in long, useless speeches but should get down to practical work. On that point I am in full agreement with Mr. Tsarapkin.

The CHAIRMAN (United Kingdom): I call on the representative of the Soviet Union, who also wishes to exercise his right of reply.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translation from Russian): The representative of the United States, together with the representative of Italy who supported him, has tried to defend here the aggressive foreign policy of the United States. For this purpose he reiterated the usual distorted assessment -- well known to us -- of the situation in Viet Nam and in the world in general. There is only one thing we can say to this: namely, that it is impossible to defend the indefensible. No matter what you say here to justify the imperialistic policy of the United States, the rumble coming from the war in far-off South-East Asia is penetrating this room. What the United States is doing in violating the sovereignty of independent States -- I refer to the Dominican Republic -- is also bound to have an influence on our negotiations, because it shows how armed force is being used in our times, in our present-day conditions.

Mr. Foster has said -- and I quote his words as I heard them in the interpretation: "Our objective in Viet Nam is not military conquest but peaceful settlement." (supra, p. 21). If that is so, then why have you sent your troops to Viet Nam? Why are you bombarding the people living in North Viet Nam and the people living in South Viet Nam? If your objective is not military conquest, withdraw all your troops from there down to the last man. Only then will we believe those words; otherwise they are sham, Mr. Foster.

The "Geneva spirit" has been mentioned here. The "Geneva spirit" means the peaceful coexistence of States, not military aggression against small States, against

(Mr. Tsarapkin, USSR)

weak States. So stop juggling with the words "the Geneva spirit", Mr. Cavalletti, when we point out such glaring facts of aggression as the war in Viet Nam and the intervention in the Dominican Republic and in other parts of the world.

With that I shall now end my statement, and I think that we shall have some further clarifications and remarks to make after studying the record, if it should be necessary to do so.

The Conference decided to issue the following communiqué:

"The Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament today held its 220th plenary meeting in the Palais des Nations, Geneva, under the chairmanship of Lord Chalfont, representative of the United Kingdom.

"Statements were made by the representatives of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United States and Italy.

"The next meeting of the Conference will be held on Thursday, 5 August 1965, at 10.30 a.m."

The meeting rose at 12 noon

